

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**IN RE: MONITRONICS
INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
TELEPHONE CONSUMER
PROTECTION ACT LITIGATION**

MDL NO. 1:13MD2493-IMK

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

Bennett v. Monitronics International, Inc.,
Case No. 1:14-CV-00034
Charvat v. Monitronics International, Inc.,
Case No. 1:14-CV-162
Dolemba v. Monitronics International, Inc.,
Case No. 1:14-CV-00066
Hodgin, et al. v. Monitronics, International, Inc.,
Case No. 1:13-CV-00263
Mey v. Monitronics, International, Inc., et al.,
Case No. 5:11-CV-90
Mey, et al. v. Honeywell International, Inc., et al.,
Case No. 1:14-CV-00059
O'Shea v. Alliance Security, LLC, et al.,
Case No. 1:13-CV-00264

**DEFENDANT UTC FIRE AND SECURITY AMERICAS
CORPORATION, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS'
SECOND AMENDED MASTER CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT**

Defendant UTC Fire and Security Americas Corporation, Inc. ("UTCFS") answers and avers as follows, the numbered paragraphs corresponding to the like-numbered paragraphs of the Second Amended Master Consolidated Complaint (Dkt. No. 255) ("SAMCC"). Section headings from the SAMCC are included below for ease of reference.

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, "the Federal Trade Commission's recent Biennial Report to Congress" is a written document that speaks for itself, and UTCFS lacks

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

2. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

3. UTCFS admits that it is an alarm manufacturer. UTCFS denies that it enables telemarketing abuses through a compensation structure between itself, alarm-monitoring companies, and alarm dealers. The remainder of this Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

4. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph with the exception that UTCFS permits the use of its trademark and trade names in certain circumstances.

5. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. Moreover, this Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegation that it benefits due to the sale by third parties of its products. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

6. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies

the same.

7. To the extent the allegations in this Paragraph are directed toward UTCFS, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph. UTCFS also denies the allegations in this Paragraph to the extent they call for a legal conclusion. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations directed toward other defendants and therefore denies the same.

8. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

9. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph. UTCFS specifically denies that it is a “seller,” and that liability should be imputed to it in this matter.

10. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies that “comparatively small dealers placed millions of illegal telemarketing calls to sell UTCFS alarm-systems and generate alarm-monitoring business for Monitronics.” The remainder of this Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a further response is required, UTCFS denies the remaining allegations in this Paragraph.

11. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. Moreover, this Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations as to why plaintiffs bring this action. Further, the SAMCC is a written document that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

13. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

14. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

15. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

16. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

III. PARTIES AND DEFINITIONS

17. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

- a. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- b. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- c. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- d. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

- e. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- f. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- g. UTCFS admits that Diana Mey is a resident of West Virginia.
- h. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

18. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

- a. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
- b. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
- c. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
- d. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any

event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

- e. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
- f. UTCFS admits that it is a Delaware corporation, and that it is an alarm manufacturer. UTCFS denies that it does business as GE Security.

19. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.

- a. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.
- b. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.
- c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. Moreover, this Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.

20. UTCFS admits the allegations in this Paragraph directed toward it. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations directed toward other defendants and therefore denies the same.

21. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

22. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

a. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

b. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

IV. APPLICABLE LAW

A. TCPA § 227(b) regulates autodialer and artificial or prerecorded voice calls to cellular and residential phones.

23. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and

UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

24. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

25. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

26. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

27. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

28. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

B. TCPA § 227(c) regulates telemarketing calls made to phone numbers listed on the Do Not Call Registry.

29. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response, and contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the provisions of the TCPA's implementing regulations speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

30. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the provisions of the TCPA's implementing regulations speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

31. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the statutory provisions of the TCPA speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

32. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

C. The TCPA imposes liability on entities that do not directly place illegal calls.

33. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

34. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the FCC's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Mem. and Order, is a written document that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

35. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the FCC's Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991; Request of State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company for Clarification of Declaratory Ruling, Declaratory Ruling, is a written document that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

36. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, *In re Joint Pet. Filed by Dish Network* is a written document that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

V. FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE COMPLAINT

A. Allegations regarding calls placed to Plaintiffs.

37. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response. To the extent plaintiffs characterize the chart as allegations against UTCFS, UTCFS denies such allegations.

38. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

Plaintiff Jason Bennett

39. Plaintiff Bennett does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

40. Plaintiff Bennett does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

41. Plaintiff Bennett does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

42. Plaintiff Bennett does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

Plaintiff Edith Bowler

43. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

44. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- a. UTCFS denies that UTCFS Authorized Dealers placed calls for the purpose of selling or promoting the sale of UTCFS alarm systems.
- b. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

45. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

46. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

47. UTCFS denies that Security One is the marketing department for GE. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

48. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

49. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

Plaintiff Philip J. Charvat

50. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

51. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

52. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

53. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, to the extent these allegations do not relate to UTCFS, they do not require a response.

54. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

Plaintiff Scott Dolemba

55. Plaintiff Dolemba does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

56. Plaintiff Dolemba does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

57. Plaintiff Dolemba does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

58. Plaintiff Dolemba does not assert claims against UTCFS and therefore no response to this Paragraph is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

Plaintiffs Michael and Janet Hodgin

59. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

60. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, and to the extent the allegations in this Paragraph are directed toward UTCFS, UTCFS denies those allegations. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations directed toward other defendants and therefore denies the same.

61. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

62. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as there is no allegation in this Paragraph that a call was made on UTCFS' behalf or that UTCFS benefitted from the call.

Plaintiff James "Garry" Hough

63. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

64. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

a. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

b. UTCFS denies that UTCFS Authorized Dealers placed calls for the purpose of selling or promoting the sale of UTCFS alarm systems.

c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

65. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

66. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

67. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

68. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

69. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

70. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

Plaintiff Diana Mey

71. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

72. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

73. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

74. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

a. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

b. UTCFS denies that UTCFS Authorized Dealers placed calls for the purpose of selling or promoting the sale of UTCFS alarm systems.

c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

d. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate

to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

- e. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

75. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as there is no allegation in this Paragraph that a call was made on UTCFS' behalf or that UTCFS benefitted from the call.

Mey allegations regarding VMS/Alliance, Monitronics, and UTCFS

76. To the extent the allegations in this Paragraph are directed toward UTCFS, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph. UTCFS specifically denies that surveys were intended to generate alarm system sales for UTCFS. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations directed toward other defendants and therefore denies the same.

77. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

78. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

- a. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as there is no allegation in this Paragraph that a call was made on UTCFS' behalf or that UTCFS benefitted from the call.
- b. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- c. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- d. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- e. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- f. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- g. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- h. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- i. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- j. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

k. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

79. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

80. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

81. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

82. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

Mey allegations regarding ISI Alarms, Monitronics, and Honeywell

83. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

84. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

85. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

Plaintiff Kerry O'Shea

86. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

87. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

a. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

b. UTCFS denies that UTCFS Authorized Dealers placed calls for the purpose of selling or promoting the sale of UTCFS alarm systems.

c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

88. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

89. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

90. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

91. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

92. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

93. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

B. VMS/Alliance placed telemarketing calls in violation of the TCPA.

94. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

95. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

96. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the

extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

C. ISI Alarms placed telemarketing calls in violation of the TCPA.

97. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

98. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

99. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

D. UTCFS is liable for the TCPA violations of UTCFS Authorized Dealers.

100. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- a. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.
To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- b. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- d. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

101. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- a. UTCFS denies that it “puts its products into the hands of consumers.” UTCFS admits that it does not sell the alarm systems to homeowners or businesses, and that third-parties resell or give the products away for free.
- b. UTCFS admits that in certain circumstances, it sells its alarms to a middleman, EDIST Distribution Company, which then resells them to dealers.
- c. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.
- d. UTCFS denies the vague allegation that it “deals directly” with dealers.

UTCFS admits that in approximately 2008 or 2009, it contacted Mr. Gotra to inquire as to whether he wished to use the GE Security trademark. UTCFS further admits that upon entering into an agreement with Mr. Gotra in or about June 2009, it was generally aware that VMS utilized telemarketing in its efforts to sell its own and Monitronics’ services. UTCFS denies the remaining allegations in this Paragraph.

- e. UTCFS admits that in certain circumstances, it extends special pricing and volume-purchase discounts to its third-party distributor, EDIST. UTCFS further admits that in certain circumstances, it seeks exclusivity arrangements with its dealers.
- f. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS admits that it enters into written agreements with certain entities authorizing the use of the GE Security trademark. UTCFS denies the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, in particular that outside of the use of the GE trademark, UTCFS exercises control over Authorized Dealers.
- g. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the agreement is a written contract that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.
 - (i) This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the agreement is a written contract that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.
 - (ii) This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the agreement is a written contract that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.
 - (iii) This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the agreement is a written

contract that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

(iv) This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the agreement is a written contract that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

(v) This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the agreement is a written contract that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

h. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the phrase “similar contracts” is insufficiently defined and thus UTCFS is unable to answer the allegations in this Paragraph.

i. UTCFS admits that VMS bought products from third-party EDIST. In any event, this Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the remaining allegations in this Paragraph.

j. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the dealer agreements are written documents that speak for themselves, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.

k. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

- l. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph. UTCFS further denies the allegations in this paragraph to the extent that they allege that UTCFS possessed authority or control over Authorized Dealers', including VMS/Alliance's, alleged telemarketing activities or that Authorized Dealers sold UTCFS' security products.

- m. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.
- n. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.
- o. UTCFS admits that it terminated VMS as a dealer on April 9, 2012. The court's partial summary judgment order is a written document that speaks for itself, and UTCFS denies any allegation inconsistent therewith.
- p. UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph. UTCFS further denies the allegations in this Paragraph to the extent that they allege that UTCFS possessed authority or control over Authorized Dealers', including VMS/Alliance's, alleged telemarketing activities or that Authorized Dealers sold UTCFS' security products.

E. Monitronics is liable for the TCPA violations of Monitronics Authorized Dealers.

102. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

- a. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.
In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate

to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

b. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

c. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

d. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

103. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

a. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In

any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

b. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

c. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

d. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(i) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(ii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(iii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(iv) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(v) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(vi) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(vii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(viii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies

the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

(ix) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

- e. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- f. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- g. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- h. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- i. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

(i) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

- (ii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
 - (iii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
 - (iv) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
 - (v) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
- j. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
- k. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In

any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

- l. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.
- m. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
 - (i) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
 - (ii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.
 - (iii) UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

n. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

o. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

F. Honeywell is liable for the TCPA violations of [Honeywell] Authorized Dealers.

104. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

105. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

106. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

107. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

108. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

109. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the

extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

110. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

111. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

112. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

113. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

114. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS.

115. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. In any event, these allegations do not require a response as they do not relate to UTCFS. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

116. This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action. UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

a. This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action. UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

(i) This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action.

UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

(ii) This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action.

UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

(iii) This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action.

UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

b. This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action. UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

c. This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action. UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

(i) This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action.

UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

(ii) This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action.

UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

(iii) This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action.

UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

117. This Paragraph concerns plaintiffs' attempts to bring a class action. UTCFS denies that a class action is appropriate in this matter.

118. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.

- a. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.
- b. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.
- c. This Paragraph does not contain any allegations of fact about UTCFS that require a response.

119. UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

120. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph and therefore denies the same.

121. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

122. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

123. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

124. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

125. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

VII. LEGAL CLAIMS

Count One:

Violation of § 227(b)(1) for calls made using an ATDS or artificial/prerecorded voice

126. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

Count Two:

Violation of § 227(c) for calls placed to numbers listed on the Do Not Call Registry

127. This Paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, UTCFS denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT

1. UTCFS denies that plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.
2. UTCFS denies that plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.
3. UTCFS denies that plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.
4. UTCFS denies that plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.
5. UTCFS denies that plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

By way of further response, UTCFS alleges the following affirmative defenses to the allegations and claims in the SAMCC. UTCFS reserves its right to amend its Answer to assert other defenses as they may become known. By setting forth any particular defense below, UTCFS does not allege or admit that it has the burden of proof and/or persuasion with respect to any of these matters, and does not assume the burden of proof and/or persuasion as to any matters to which plaintiffs bear such a burden.

First Affirmative Defense

The SAMCC fails to state facts sufficient to state a cause of action against UTCFS.

Second Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs lack standing to assert the claims alleged in the SAMCC.

Third Affirmative Defense

This Court lacks personal jurisdiction over UTCFS.

Fourth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that plaintiffs have expressly or impliedly consented to and approved all of the acts and omissions about which plaintiffs now complain. Accordingly, plaintiffs are barred from pursuing claims alleged in the SAMCC.

Fifth Affirmative Defense

With respect to claims asserting violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), UTCFS asserts that plaintiffs provided prior express written consent.

Sixth Affirmative Defense

With respect to claims asserting violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), UTCFS asserts that plaintiffs maintained an established business relationship with the caller.

Seventh Affirmative Defense

With respect to claims asserting violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), UTCFS asserts that plaintiffs' claims are barred because they encouraged the telemarketing and did not inform the telemarketer that they wished to be placed on an internal do not call list.

Eighth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that by plaintiffs' conduct, representations, and omissions, upon which UTCFS detrimentally relied, plaintiffs are equitably estopped from asserting any claim for relief against UTCFS.

Ninth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS did not "benefit" from any telemarketing, as that term is contemplated by the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Tenth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that no relief may be obtained by plaintiffs by reason of the doctrine of unclean hands.

Eleventh Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that plaintiffs are not entitled to any relief because UTCFS' conduct did not proximately cause any damages, injury or loss to plaintiffs.

Twelfth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that granting plaintiffs' demand would result in unjust enrichment, as plaintiffs would receive more money than plaintiffs are entitled to receive.

Thirteenth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that at the times and places, and under the circumstances alleged, the damages to plaintiffs, if any, were caused solely by the acts or omissions of one or more third persons over whom UTCFS had no control, and for which UTCFS is not responsible or liable to plaintiffs. UTCFS dealers are not its agents. UTCFS did not assent to or ratify any dealer's conduct. No entity acted "on behalf of" UTCFS as that term is contemplated by the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. UTCFS reserves the right, without obligation, to supplement this

affirmative defense to identify specific third-parties whose conduct caused plaintiffs' damages, if any.

Fourteenth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that the losses or damages, if any, of which plaintiffs complain were directly, proximately and entirely caused and contributed to by the negligence, culpable conduct or fault of others, whether or not named as parties to this action. If plaintiffs are entitled to recover from UTCFS at all for damages (which is denied), such recovery is diminished to the extent the damages alleged in the SAMCC and any and all subsequent amendments and/or supplements thereto are attributable to the negligence, culpable conduct or fault of others. UTCFS reserves the right, without obligation, to supplement this affirmative defense to identify specific third-parties whose conduct caused plaintiffs' damages, if any.

Fifteenth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that to the extent plaintiffs have suffered any damages as a result of any alleged activities of UTCFS (which UTCFS denies), plaintiffs' damages are attributable, in whole or in part, to their own conduct in failing to take action to mitigate or minimize such purported damages, as required by law.

Sixteenth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims should be dismissed to the extent they are barred by the doctrine of laches.

Seventeenth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statute(s) of limitation.

Eighteenth Affirmative Defense

UTCFS alleges that by conduct, representations, and omissions, plaintiffs have waived, relinquished, and/or abandoned any claim for relief against UTCFS respecting the matters that are the subject of the SAMCC.

Nineteenth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs are equitably estopped from seeking recovery to the extent they purchased the products marketed to them via telemarketing.

Twentieth Affirmative Defense

The damages plaintiffs seek against UTCFS violate the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and constitute excessive fines in violation of the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Twenty-First Affirmative Defense

In the alternative, with respect to claims asserting violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), UTCFS asserts that it has established and implemented, with due care, reasonable practices and procedures effectively to prevent telephone solicitations in violation of this provision.

Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims are barred because they have failed to join necessary and indispensable parties in this action.

Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims against UTCFS are barred in whole, or in part, by the TCPA's "safe harbor" provision or other "safe harbor" defenses.

Twenty-Fourth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims against UTCFS are barred because the calls about which they complain constitute commercial speech protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and the imposition of liability on UTCFS for such calls would violate its First Amendment rights.

Twenty-Fifth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims are barred because UTCFS did not engage in willful and/or knowing misconduct.

Twenty-Sixth Affirmative Defense

To the extent UTCFS is liable to plaintiffs or the proposed classes they seek to represent, UTCFS is entitled to indemnification from one or more parties or third parties.

WHEREFORE, UTCFS prays for judgment as follows:

1. That plaintiffs take nothing by reason of their Complaint;
2. That judgment be entered against plaintiffs and in favor of UTCFS;
3. That UTCFS recover all expenses, costs, and attorneys' fees in connection with this lawsuit; and
4. That the Court grant UTCFS such other and further relief as it deems just and proper.

December 8, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gordon H. Copland

Gordon H. Copland
Christopher A. Lauderman
STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC
400 White Oaks Blvd.
Bridgeport, WV 26330
(304) 933-8162
(304) 933-8183 (Fax)

/s/ Jeffrey L. Poston

Jeffrey L. Poston (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Rebecca B. Chaney (admitted *pro hac vice*)
CROWELL & MORING LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 624-2500
(202) 628-5116 (Fax)

Counsel for Defendant UTC Fire and Security Americas Corporation, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on the 8th day of December, 2014, I electronically filed “Defendant UTC Fire and Security Americas Corporation, Inc.’s Answer to Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Master Consolidated Complaint” with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following CM/ECF participants:

John W. Barrett, Esq.
Jonathan R. Marshall, Esq.
Bailey & Glasser, LLP
209 Capitol Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Counsel for Plaintiff Diana Mey

Matthew P. McCue, Esq.
The Law Office of Matthew P. McCue
1 South Avenue, 3rd Floor
Natick, MA 01760
Counsel for Plaintiff Diana Mey

Frederick W. Kosmo, Jr., Esq.
Meryl C. Maneker, Esq.
Robert Kenneth Dixon, Esq.
Vickie E. Turner, Esq.
Wilson Turner Kosmo, LLP
550 West C Street, Suite 1050
San Diego, CA 92101
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Niall A. Paul, Esq.
John R. Teare, Jr., Esq.
Clifford F. Kinney, Jr., Esq.
Spilman Thomas & Battle PLLC - Wheeling
300 Kanawha Boulevard E
P.O. Box 273
Charleston, WV 25321
*Counsel for Versatile Marketing Solutions, Inc.
d/b/a VMS Alarms*

Alexander Macia, Esq.
Charity K. Flynn, Esq.
Leah P. Macia, Esq.
Spilman Thomas & Battle PLLC
300 Kanawha Blvd. E
P. O. Box 273
Charleston, WV 25321-0273
Counsel for Honeywell International, Inc.

Alysa Hutnik, Esq.
Kelley Drye & Warren
Washington Harbour, Suite 400
3050 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20007
Counsel for Honeywell International, Inc.

Lauri A. Mazzuchetti, Esq.
Michael A. Innes
Kelley Drye & Warren
200 Kimball Drive
Parsippany, NJ 07054
Counsel for Honeywell International, Inc.

Christina S. Terek, Esq.
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1233 Main Street
P. O. Box 831
Wheeling, WV 26003
*Counsel for Versatile Marketing Solutions,
Inc. d/b/a VMS Alarms*

Kim Williams, Esq.
Roblin John Williamson, Esq.
Williamson & Williams
936 N. 34th Street, Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98103
*Counsel for Janet Hodgin and Michael
Hodgin; Edith Bowler; Kenneth Clark and
James G. Hough*

Benjamin Dyer, Esq.
Margaret Jeanne Carlson
Culp & Dyer, LLP
222 East McKinney St., Ste. 210
Denton, TX 76201
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Seyed Abbas Kazerounian, Esq.
Jason A. Ibey, Esq.
Kazerounian Law Group, APC
245 Fischer Avenue, Suite D1
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Counsel for George Cain

Ronald A. Marron, Esq.
Beatrice Skye Resendes, Esq.
Alexis Marie Wood, Esq.
Kas L. Gallucci, Esq.
Law Offices of Ronald A. Marron, APLC
651 Arroyo Drive
San Diego, CA 92103
Counsel for Kerry O'Shea

Beth E. Terrell, Esq.
Mary B. Reiten, Esq.
Kimberlee L. Gunning, Esq.
Terrell Marshall Daudt & Willie PLLC
936 North 34th St., Ste. 300
Seattle, WA 98103-8869
*Counsel for Janet Hodgin and Michael Hodgin;
Edith Bowler; Kenneth Clark and James G. Hough*

Ashley Lauren Watkins, Esq.
John Goldmark, Esq.
Kenneth E. Payson, Esq.
Davis Wright Tremaine
1201 Third Ave., Ste. 2200
Seattle, WA 98101-3045
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Richard J. Foster, Esq.
Law Office of Richard J. Foster
500 East Pacific Coast Hwy., Ste. 210-A
Seal Beach, CA 90740
Counsel for George Cain

Joshua B. Swigart, Esq.
Hyde & Swigart
2221 Camino Del Rio South, Ste. 101
San Diego, CA 92108
Counsel for George Cain

Douglas J. Campion, Esq.
Law Offices of Douglas J. Campion
409 Camino Del Rio South, Ste. 303
San Diego, CA 92108
Counsel for Kerry O'Shea

Daniel A. Edelman, Esq.
Cathleen M. Combs, Esq.
Francis Richard Greene, Esq.
James O. Lattuner, Esq.
Edelman, Combs, Lattuner & Goodwin LLC
20 South Clark Street, Suite 1500
Chicago, IL 60603
Counsel for Merrill Primack

Eric L. Samore, Esq.
Albert M. Bower, Esq.
Yesha Sutaria, Esq.
SmithAMundsen, LLC
150 North Michigan Ave., Suite 3300
Chicago, IL 60601
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Sean P. Flynn, Esq.
Foley and Mansfield, PLLP
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Counsel for Alliance Security, LLC

James Marvin Feagle, Esq.
Skaar & Feagle, LLP-Decatur
108 East Ponce de Leon Ave., Suite 204
Decatur, GA 30030
Counsel for James Giles

Justin Tharpe Holcombe, Esq.
Kris Kelly Skaar, Esq.
Skaar & Feagle, LLP-Marietta
P. O. Box 1478
331 Washington Ave.
Marietta, GA 30061
Counsel for James Giles

Earl P. Underwood, Jr., Esq.
21 South Section Street
Fairhope, AL 36532
Phone: (251) 990-5558
Counsel for Jason Bennett

John R. Cox, Esq.
9786-A Timber Circle
Spanish Fort, AL 36527
Counsel for Jason Bennett

Kenneth J. Riemer, Esq.
Underberg & Kessler LLP
300 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, NY 14604
Counsel for Merrill Primack

Crawford S. McGivaren, Jr., Esq.
Diane Babb Maughan, Esq.
Crawford S. McGivaren, Jr., Esq.
Cabaniss, Johnston, Gardner, Dumas & O'Neal
P. O. Box 830612
Birmingham, AL 35283-0612
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Ian David Rosenthal, Esq.
Cabaniss, Johnston, Gardner, Dumas & O'Neal
P. O. Box 2906
Mobile, AL 36652
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

James Allen Maines, Esq.
Paul E. Vranicar, Esq.
Holland & Knight-Atlanta
1201 West Peachtree Street, NE
One Atlantic Center, Suite 2000
Atlanta, GA 30309-3453
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Robert B. Newkirk, III, Esq.
Newkirk Law Office, P.A.
P.O. Box 2536
19810 W. Catawba Avenue
Cornelius, NC 28031
Counsel for ISI Alarms NC, Inc.

Sergei Lemberg
Lemberg & Associates
3rd Floor
1100 Summer Street
Stamford, CT 06905
Counsel for Sandra Fairley

Anthony Paronich, Esq.
Edward A. Broderick, Esq.
Broderick Law, P.C.
125 Summer St., Suite 1030
Boston, MA 02110
Counsel for Plaintiff Diana Mey

Charles R. Pinkerton, Esq.
Compton & Associates, PLLC
1101 Mountainview Manor
Morgantown, WV 26501
*Counsel for Allen Beavers, Dakota Dalton,
Diane Elder and Michelle Wakeley*

Christopher K. Jones, Esq.
John P. Wolff, III, Esq.
Keogh, Cox & Wilson, Ltd.
701 Main Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802
Counsel for Keith Finklea

Cassandra P. Miller, Esq.
Edelman, Combs, Lattuner & Goodwin LLC
20 South Clark Street
Suite 1500
Chicago, IL 60603
*Counsel for Nicholas Shreders, Jonathan
Mraunac and Vincent Brizgys*

Brian K. Murphy, Esq.
Joseph F. Murray, Esq.
Murray Murphy Moul & Basil – 2
1533 Lake Shore Drive
Columbus, OH 43204
Counsel for Phillip J. Charvat

Daniel J. Williams, Esq.
Law Offices of Daniel J. Williams
402 West Broadway
Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101
Counsel for Kenneth Moser

Jeffrey A. Holmstrand, Esq.
Flaherty Sensabaugh Bonasso PLLC – Wheeling
P. O. Box 6545
Wheeling, WV 26003
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

John G. Farnan, Esq.
Weston Hurd – Cleveland
Suite 1900
1301 East Ninth Street
Cleveland, OH 44114
Counsel for Monitronics International, Inc.

Madeleine Amadea Groseclose, Esq.
Foley & Mansfield, PLLP
300 South Grand Avenue
Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Counsel for Alliance Security, Inc.

I also hereby certify that I served a true and accurate copy of the foregoing “Defendant UTC Fire and Security Americas Corporation, Inc.’s Answer to Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Master Consolidated Complaint” by United States Mail, First Class, postage prepaid, upon the following *pro se* person:

Craig Cunningham
5543 Edmondson Pike
Suite 248
Nashville, TN 37211

/s/ **Gordon H. Copland**

Gordon H. Copland, Esq. (WV Bar. No. 828)

STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC

400 White Oaks Blvd.

Bridgeport, WV 26330

Telephone: (304) 933-8162

Facsimile: (304) 933-8183

*Counsel for Defendant UTC Fire And Security
Americas Corporation Inc*